

Environmental Protection Agency

§ 35.970

§ 35.950 Suspension, termination or annulment of grants.

Grants may be suspended under § 30.915, or terminated or annulled under § 30.920. The State agency shall be concurrently notified in writing of any such action.

§ 35.955 Grant amendments to increase grant amounts.

Grant agreements may be amended under § 30.900-1 of this chapter for project changes which have been approved under §§ 30.900 and 35.935-11 of this subchapter. However, no grant agreement may be amended to increase the amount of a grant unless the State agency has approved the grant increase from available State allotments and reallocations under § 35.915.

§ 35.960 Disputes.

(a) The Regional Administrator's final determination on the ineligibility of a project (see § 35.915(h)) or a grant applicant (see § 35.920-1), on the Federal share (see § 35.930-5(b)), or on any dispute arising under a grant shall be final and conclusive unless the applicant or grantee appeals within 30 days from the date of receipt of the final determination. (See subpart J of part 30 of this subchapter.)

(b) The EPA General Counsel will publish periodically as a Notice document in the FEDERAL REGISTER a digest of grant appeals decisions.

§ 35.965 Enforcement.

If the Regional Administrator determines that the grantee has failed to comply with any provision of this subpart, he may impose any of the following sanctions:

(a) The grant may be terminated or annulled under § 30.920 of this subchapter;

(b) Project costs directly related to the noncompliance may be disallowed;

(c) Payment otherwise due to the grantee of up to 10 percent may be withheld (see § 30.615-3 of this chapter);

(d) Project work may be suspended under § 30.915 of this subchapter;

(e) A noncomplying grantee may be found nonresponsible or ineligible for future Federal assistance or a noncomplying contractor may be found nonresponsible or ineligible for approval

for future contract award under EPA grants;

(f) An injunction may be entered or other equitable relief afforded by a court of appropriate jurisdiction;

(g) Such other administrative or judicial action may be instituted if it is legally available and appropriate.

§ 35.970 Contract enforcement.

(a) *Regional Administrator authority.* At the request of a grantee, the Regional Administrator is authorized to provide technical and legal assistance in the administration and enforcement of any contract related to treatment works for which an EPA grant was made and to intervene in any civil action involving the enforcement of such contracts, including contract disputes which are the subject of either arbitration or court action. Any assistance is to be provided at the discretion of the Regional Administrator and in a manner determined to best serve the public interest. Factors which the Regional Administrator may consider in determining whether to provide assistance are:

(1) Available agency resources.

(2) Planned or ongoing enforcement action.

(3) The grantee's demonstration of good faith to resolve contract matters at issue.

(4) The grantee's adequate documentation.

(5) The Federal interest in the contract matters at issue.

(b) *Grantee request.* The grantee's request for technical or legal assistance should be submitted in writing and be accompanied by documentation adequate to inform the Regional Administrator of the nature and necessity of the requested assistance. A grantee may orally request assistance from the Regional Administrator on an emergency basis.

(c) *Privity of contract.* The Regional Administrator's technical or legal involvement in any contract dispute will not make EPA a party to any contract entered into by the grantee. (See § 35.936-8.)

(d) *Delegation to States.* The authority to provide technical and legal assistance in the administration of contract matters described in this section may

be delegated to a State agency under subpart F of this part if the State agency can demonstrate that it has the appropriate legal authority to undertake such functions.

APPENDIX A TO SUBPART E OF PART 35—
COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS
GUIDELINES

1. *Purpose.* These guidelines represent Agency policies and procedures for determining the most cost-effective waste treatment management system or component part.

2. *Authority.* These guidelines are provided under sections 212(2)(C) and 217 of the Clean Water Act.

3. *Applicability.* These guidelines, except as otherwise noted, apply to all facilities planning under step 1 grant assistance awarded after September 30, 1978. The guidelines also apply to State or locally financed facilities planning on which subsequent step 2 or step 3 Federal grant assistance is based.

4. *Definitions.* Terms used in these guidelines are defined as follows:

a. *Waste treatment management system.* Used synonymously with “complete waste treatment system” as defined in §35.905 of this subpart.

b. *Cost-effectiveness analysis.* An analysis performed to determine which waste treatment management system or component part will result in the minimum total resources costs over time to meet Federal, State, or local requirements.

c. *Planning period.* The period over which a waste treatment management system is evaluated for cost-effectiveness. The planning period begins with the system's initial operation.

d. *Useful life.* The estimated period of time during which a treatment works or a component of a waste treatment management system will be operated.

e. *Disaggregation.* The process or result of breaking down a sum total of population or economic activity for a State or other jurisdiction (i.e., designated 208 area or SMSA) into smaller areas or jurisdictions.

5. *Identification, selection, and screening of alternatives.* a. *Identification of alternatives.* All feasible alternative waste management systems shall be initially identified. These alternatives should include systems discharging to receiving waters, land application systems, on-site and other non-centralized systems, including revenue generating applications, and systems employing the reuse of wastewater and recycling of pollutants. In identifying alternatives, the applicant shall consider the possibility of no action and staged development of the system.

b. *Screening of alternatives.* The identified alternatives shall be systematically screened

to determine those capable of meeting the applicable Federal, State and local criteria.

c. *Selection of alternatives.* The identified alternatives shall be initially analyzed to determine which systems have cost-effective potential and which should be fully evaluated according to the cost-effectiveness analysis procedures established in the guidelines.

d. *Extent of effort.* The extent of effort and the level of sophistication used in the cost-effectiveness analysis should reflect the project's size and importance. Where processes or techniques are claimed to be innovative technology on the basis of the cost reduction criterion contained in paragraph 6e(1) of appendix E to this subpart, a sufficiently detailed cost analysis shall be included to substantiate the claim to the satisfaction of the Regional Administrator.

6. *Cost-effectiveness analysis procedures.*

a. *Method of analysis.* The resources costs shall be determined by evaluating opportunity costs. For resources that can be expressed in monetary terms, the analysis will use the interest (discount) rate established in paragraph 6e. Monetary costs shall be calculated in terms of present worth values or equivalent annual values over the planning period defined in section 6b. The analysis shall descriptively present nonmonetary factors (e.g., social and environmental) in order to determine their significance and impact. Nonmonetary factors include primary and secondary environmental effects, implementation capability, operability, performance reliability and flexibility. Although such factors as use and recovery of energy and scarce resources and recycling of nutrients are to be included in the monetary cost analysis, the non-monetary evaluation shall also include them. The most cost-effective alternative shall be the waste treatment management system which the analysis determines to have the lowest present worth or equivalent annual value unless nonmonetary costs are overriding. The most cost-effective alternative must also meet the minimum requirements of applicable effluent limitations, groundwater protection, or other applicable standards established under the Act.

b. *Planning period.* The planning period for the cost-effectiveness analysis shall be 20 years.

c. *Elements of monetary costs.* The monetary costs to be considered shall include the total value of the resources which are attributable to the waste treatment management system or to one of its component parts. To determine these values, all monies necessary for capital construction costs and operation and maintenance costs shall be identified.

(1) Capital construction costs used in a cost-effective analysis shall include all contractors' costs of construction including